DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 378 SP 008 689

AUTHOR Husman, Burris F.
TITLE The Future of Athletics in Higher Education--Can They Survive.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 12p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Athletic Programs; *Athletics; Budgets; Educational Objectives; Educational Programs; *Financial Support; Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; Scholarships; *Values

ABSTRACT

This speech is devoted to the question of whether athletics, or more specifically, highly recruited athletic teams can survive. First, these programs are in financial trouble. Big-time athletic programs are financed in part by student fees whether the students wish to attend the games or not; consequently, student government associations and other student organizations are waging a bitter antiathletic compaign on many campuses. The Women's Liberation Movement is beginning to add to the financial trouble of big-time athletics by demanding equal athletic budgets. Second, the educational values of athletics are being questioned; there is little empirical evidence to support athletics as an educational endeavor. In recent years the socialization of sports has caused an overemphasis on winning. The author recommends that two athletic programs should be established in our colleges and universities. One program would be highly recruited and labelled "big-time," the objective of which would be entertainment. The other program would use nonrecruited athletes, the goal of which would be educational. This division will provide a program for those who wish to attempt the difficult climb to excellence and for those individuals who wish to play for fun. (JA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Future of Athletics in Higher Education -- Can They Survive

Burris F. Husman

University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

"Behold the turtle who makes progress only when he sticks his neck out!"

In my presentation, I have decided to question whether athletics, as they are now administered, can survive. First, let me make it perfectly clear, I am speaking about the highly recruited athletic teams; i.e., the big business and entertainment projects that exist on too many college and university campuses. These programs are in trouble! In addition to being in deep financial trouble, they are being challenged as an educational endeavor and also at the very basis of their being -- by the athletes themselves.

I take this stand at the risk of being extremely unpopular; of creating considerable emotional turmoil in many of you; of causing some of you to become completely unnerved; of amusing a few; and perhaps most important, of causing some of you to evaluate your current position on athletics.

We all know that there are pressures in big time athletics to win, especially in football and basketball. These sports are the money makers in most institutions. Failure to win in these two sports reduces revenues and thus reduces or curtails the so called minor sports where there is less pressure to win.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

According to Peter McIntosh, it is more difficult to define moral and ethical values in highly competitive sport since they are filled with emotion.[1] If this be true, the loss of revenue in athletics has a double-barrel effect on the program. It increases the pressure to win in the money making sports, making it more difficult to teach values, and at the same time it reduces or curtails the minor sports program where moral and educational values are more likely to be taught.

Most big time athletic programs are financed in part by student fees. The student newspaper at the University of Maryland recently reported that student fees accounted for approximately 40% of the athletic budget income. In this system the student pays an activity fee which entitles him to attend all athletic events held on the campus during the academic year. It should be noted that students are required to pay the fee even though they may not be interested in attending the athletic contests. Herein lies one of the major financial problems facing athletics. Many students believe that those attending the contest should pay the fee, not those who have no interest in attending. For this reason, student government association and other student organizations are waging a bitter anti-athletic campaign on many campuses.

The financial problem does not end here, however. The Women's Liberation Movement is beginning to cause despair and turmoil among male athletic directors. Women want equal rights!! If the men's athletic program has an annual budget of $400,000, the women want an annual budget of $400,000. Legally they are entitled to an equal amount, just as it has been declared that women are legally entitled to athletic scholarships. Likewise if men field teams in twelve sports the women have a right to field teams in twelve sports, and if the men's tennis team has an annual budget of $15,000, the women's tennis team should have the same amount.

Now we all know that it takes money to conduct an athletic program. Not only does it cost for travel, uniforms, coaches, officials, training tables, and so forth, it also costs to recruit and compete for outstanding athletes. This, in turn, produces a winner, which draws more spectators, which brings in more money, which increases the pressure to continue to win, which causes the exploitation of athletes. Where does the cycle end?

---

1. McIntosh, Peter C. Address, National Conference on the Development of Human Values through Sports, Springfield, Mass., October 12, 1973.

About ten years ago a graduate student in one of my classes made a study of the financial cost of fielding football and basketball teams in the Atlantic Coast Conference.[2] Only four of the eight conference schools responded to his inquiry, but the results were most interesting. It cost the four schools an average of $44,000 to field each of the eleven starting players in football, and an average of $14,000 to field each of the starting players in basketball. This means that the football budget at each school averaged over $484,000, and the basketball budget over $70,000. Remember, this was ten years ago and does not include today's inflationary prices.

Can schools finance a women's athletic program in this amount? The answer is obviously, NO! There are many present who will attempt to solve this dilemna in at least two ways. First, they will provide scholarships for women, put a few women on teams where they can compete, and then say that the women have equal rights. Women are not buying this approach, and I do not blame them. The following resolution[3] has been supported by the EAIAW and EAPECW and was recently passed unanimously at the AIAW conference in Kansas City.

WHEREAS

A single team for which men and women compete to become members strongly discriminates against women due to sex-determined physiological disadvantages in strength and speed.

WHEREAS

A mixed (co-ed) team for which participants compete against members of their own sex for membership or the team, and for which an equal number of males and females compete on opposing teams, is not discriminatory to either sex.

BE IT RESOLVED

There SHALL BE separate teams for men and women. No male student may participate on a women's intercollegiate team. No female student may participate on a men's intercollegiate team. In addition to separate teams for men and women, intercollegiate mixed (co-ed) teams composed of an equal number of males and females competing on opposing teams are DESIRABLE in those sports in which such teams are appropriate.

---

2. Lambert, Ward, "The Cost of Athletics," Unpublished Manuscript, Spring Semester, 1963-64.

3. McKnight, Dorothy & Joan Hult, Resolution Presented to EAPECW, EAIAW & AIAW, 1973.

Obviously women believe that co-ed athletic teams will increase, not decrease discrimination, since it will destroy the current women's approach to athletics. It is predicted by this writer that a legal test of the integrated team concept will occur within the next year or so, and that the ruling will be made in favor of the women.

It has already been ruled in a U.S. District Court in Illinois "that the physical and psychological differences between male and female athletes were a sufficient reason for prohibiting interscholastic competition between high school boys and girls and also supported the association's decision to conduct the girl's interscholastic sportsprogram differently from that of boys', and the imposition of restrictions."[4]

Second, women have legally been forced to accept a scholarship concept. The majority of women athletic coaches will tell you they will not recruit women athletes, will not award scholarships, and will refuse to schedule teams who do. Athletic scholarships are a relatively ineffective way to support student athletes. The cost of recruitment and the scholarship staff contribute to the existing financial problems. As previously noted, these financial difficulties erode the educational possibilities of athletics. Women will soon face the same problem as the men, and in time will be forced to abandon their traditional respect for the educational values inherent in athletics. The recent article entitled "The Positive Side of Athletic Scholarship for Women"[5] provides evidence that some women have already boarded the scholarship band wagon.

What will be the source of funds for the women's athletic program and how will we support their scholarship program? Can we secure tax support? What about gate receipts? I am of the opinion that the funds will have to come from the current athletic budget, which will have deleterious effects on the men's athletic program. Can they survive?

In addition to financial problems, the educational values of athletics are being questioned. There is little empirical evidence to support athletics as an educational endeavor. In the past, it was assumed that values, both moral and educational were derived from participation in athletics. In recent years the socialization of sport has caused an over-emphasis on winning. Our values are determined mainly by the degree we go to win.

---

4. AAHPER, UPDATE, November, 1973, p.4.
5. AAHPER, UPDATE, November, 1973, p.4.

The winning versus moral value in big time athletics philosophy is best described by two outstanding coaches. The late Jim Tatum's remark reflected this attitude, when he said, "I don't think victory is the most important thing. I think it is the only thing." After a thrilling 10-7 loss to Michigan, Hayes went Tatum one better in the area of moral license. He is quoted as saying: "We'd rather have an immoral win than a moral victory."[6] If the attitude of these coaches is permeated down to the players, it is possible that immoral not moral behavior is being taught in big time athletics.

Another problem is that sport has become institutionalized. The primary value is the institution. This causes athletics to become product oriented; i.e., to win. Thus the coach sees team members as objects in a machine like environment who need to be conditioned to perform fragmented tasks to get the team to perfection. They see team members as objects -- to be manipulated to win, to be used. There is no "I" in TEAM, thus players do not receive the self-respect which should afforded every individual in society. Players, therefore, have rebelled against the authority of the coach to gain respect.[7] It is not a question as to whether the athlete's hair is too long or whether he should shave off his mustache, but it is rather a need by the athlete to be recognized as a self-respected individual.

Further evidence of the possible negative value teaching of big time athletics has been provided by the research of Bruce Ogilvie and his associates. They have administered their Athletic Motivational Inventory to thousands of high school, college, and professional athletes. Evidence indicates that there is a modeling effect of the coach on team members. Ogilvie reports that the members of the Dallas Cowboys come to be more and more like Tom Landry over a long period of time.[8]

---

6. Flath, Arnold, Editor, Athletics in America. Keating, James W., "Paradoxes in American Athletics," pp. 17-29; Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press, 1972. 90 p.

7. VanDerbeck, Holmes N., "Respect of an Opponent On and Off the Field," Address, National Conference of Human Values Through Sport, Springfield, Mass., October 12, 1973.

8. Ogilvie, Bruce C., Address, National Conference of Human Values Through Sport, Springfield, Mass., October 12, 1973.

The Athletic Motivational Inventory[9] is designed to assess eleven traits of athletes. These traits are drive, aggression, leadership, emotional control, self-confidence, trust, mental toughness, determination, conscientiousness, coachability and guilt-proneness.

The profiles of high school and college coaches are significantly higher than those of the high school athletes. According to Ogilvie,[10] the coaches fall at the seventy-fifth percentile on most of the traits, and are even higher than professional football and basketball players. More disturbing, perhaps, is the fact that most champion and high caliber athletes shift to become more like the coaches as they get older. When one selects the top players from the already highly selective group, there is a shift on the eleven traits. Coaches and champion athletes are incredibly higher on achievement motivation. Evidence indicates that these individuals have been raised in an environment where they have been rewarded for drive. They have a tremendous drive to succeed. They have a high need to dominate, to control. They have significantly higher levels of aggression. They have an extraordinary need for autonomy and independence. They are independent, self directed and interested in their own self and not the world around them. They do not seem to be interested in the problems of other human beings. They do not care to get involved with others, and prefer to live at an emotional distance. They are not inclined to establish long term relationships. There is apparently a core-hardening in the super athlete. This according to Ogilvie,[11] is the personality model we are producing in athletics. Is it the model you would want for your child? One might ask, "Is it necessary to make the above sacrifices to excel not only in sport but in any line of endeavor?" Is it necessary to shut off the tender, sensitive, responsive side of personality to attain success; i.e., to be a real competitor? Do we have to deny sensitivity to excel? "Should everyone pursue excellence? ...It is difficult to see how a society so motivated could retain its collective mental health. ---It would be a society in which frustration, disappointment, and defeat would be the constant companion of the vast majority of its citizens. ...The great majority of earnest pursuers are inevitably doomed to fall short of excellence."[12]

---

9. Ogilvie, Bruce C., Thomas Tutko, and Leland P. Lyon, "The Motivational Inventory," Scholastic Coach, 43:1:130 (September, 1973).

10. Ogilvie, Bruce C., Address, National Conference on the Development of Human Values Through Sports, Springfield, Mass., October 12, 1973.

11. Ibid.

12. Flath, Arnold, Editor, Athletics in America. Keating, James W., "Paradoxes in American Athletics," p. 19; Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press, 1972. 90 p.

What recommendation can be made to save athletics? Are there values in athletics that are necessary in today's real world? It has been suggested that the values exist which give the student a sense of belonging in today's complex society. Dr. Wilson Elkins, President of the University of Maryland, recently had this to say about athletics on the campus: "The student is part of a community. Hopefully, he will become involved in the present and future of that community. In order to do so, he needs something besides history, Spanish, chemistry, etc. Athletics provides a medium by which students develop an attachment for the institution--and retain an interest in it. They develop a sense of belonging to the institution--of being a part of it. This sense of belonging which is manifested in many ways is probably the major benefit derived from intercollegiate athletics at the University of Maryland."[13]

The values described by Dr. Elkins can be attained in big time athletics programs as well as in those where scholarshipe are not awarded. For this reason, I would like to recommend that we establish and recognize two athletic programs in our colleges and universities. One program would be highly recruited and labelled big time, the objective of which would be entertainment. The other program would use non-recruited student athletes, the goal of which would be educational.

Recent action taken by the NCAA to restructure the association into three divisions supports this recommendation. The following describes in part the new structure rules: "Institutions select the division through a process of self determination except in the sport of football. An institution may elect Division I, while its football team may compete in Division II or III, but an institution classified Division I (Major) in football must elect Division I for all sports. ... An institution in Division II or Division III may elect to participate in Division I in one sport other than football or basketball.[14] This provides an opportunity for an institution such as Johns Hopkins University to compete with Division III teams in all sports except lacrosse where they can compete in Division I.

This action, not yet implemented, establishes competition on the basis of recruitment standards as well as the size of the institution. This is a move in the direction I am proposing. I am recommending that those schools with big time

---

13. Elkins, Wilson H., Unpublished Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, to Review the Athletic Program. College Park: University of Maryland, March 19, 1973.

14. NCAA, "A Proposal to Restructure the National Collegiate Athletic Association as Recommended by the NCAA Council, "''Unpublished Manuscript, NCAA, May 15, 1973.

athletics program, continue to expand and conduct their program but that these programs not be recognized by physical educators, educator, and educational associations. They should be recognized for what they are, entertainment.

In this proposal, those schools interested in an educational program in intercollegiate athletics would adopt the old policy statement of DGWS regarding athleti grants and scholarship.

"The Division for Girls and Women's Sports does not approve of awarding scholarships, financial awards, or of giving financial assistance designated for women participants in intercollegiate sports competition. This position is intended not to diminish, but to protect, the continued development of athletics for women. The purpose of this statement of belief is to discourage the buying or retaining of athletic talent by any college or university. Financial assistance includes any gift or gain presented prior to, or during, enrollment and/or attendance at the institution. This does not prohibit academic or economic-need scholarships but includes "talent" scholarships awarded to those whose talent is athletic in nature. DGWS believes that women in sports should choose their college or university on the basis of its academic worth and not be influenced by monetary gain because of an athletic program. Once an individual arrives on the campus of her choice, it is the earnest desire of the DGWS that a broadly diversified program of sound, educationally based athletic and recreational experiences be available to her. We believe these quality programs and experiences flourish in an environment free from pressure recruiting and performer exploitation that so often accompany the general availability of athletic scholarships."[15]

This policy does not prohibit academic or economic need scholarships awarded in open competition with the general student population. Who would legislate this program? This is a good question, since historically coaches have violated rules, athletic directors have conveniently overlooked indiscretions and college presidents have misunderstood policies.[16]

---

15. DGWS, Philosophy and Standards for Girl's and Women's Sport, Rev. ed., Washington, D.C., AAPHER, 1972

16. Olson, Edward, "Intercollegiate Athletics, Is there a way to be with it," Pittsburgh, NCPEAM Proceedings, 1973, pp. 18-23.

For this reason, as recently recommended by Edward Olson, I would propose that the AAHPER develop a strong national organization to administer the educational athletic program. (The recent vote by the women not to join the Divisions of men's athletics and Physical Education to form a sports association in the new AAHPER alliance deters the development of this concept.) When guidelines come from highly respected sources, college presidents take note, whether the organization be NCATE, NEA, or hopefully the AAHPER.[17]

In this proposal athletics scholarships and recruitment would be totally ruled out. The AAHPER's educationally sound governing body would pass and enforce a guideline similar to the previously mentioned DGWS statement. Members of the athletic department, whether it be men or women, would be prohibited from contracting directly or indirectly a prospective student athlete. Recruitment then, in the schools advocating an educational athletic program, would be forbidden. Likewise, any attempt by a member of the athletic department to influence a fellow faculty member concerning the awarding of an academic scholarship would be forbidden.

Many of you will question this recommendation, since your argument has always been that scholarships provide an opportunity for the financially deprived athlete to go to college. It is recognized that most outstanding university departments are established by recruiting outstanding faculty and then providing scholarships to recruit outstanding students. Undoubtedly, the exceptional university departments in music, art, botany, history, etc. have been established through this technique. In the case of athletics, however, there are several factors which prohibit such recognition.

First, the objectives of big time athletics are different from those of any other university endeavor. The objectives are to entertain the spectator and make money. As previously indicated, this is not to say that there are spectator values in this program, but these values are recognized as different from those of the participants and are provided at the expense of the recruited athlete.

Second, the athletic program receives extensive publicity. Only in the most unusual circumstances would a scholar in history, music or art have a column devoted to his accomplishments each week in the local newspaper; yet, the star halfback or baseball pitcher receives publicity before and after every athletic event in which he participates.[18]

---

17. Ibid.

18. Wiseman, Douglas, "Athletics are not Physical Education," Pittsbirgh; NCPEAM Proceedings, 1973. pp 17-18.

Third, the coach, unlike the academician or bandleader is usually paid extra for coaching and/or his position is entirely dependent upon the success of the team. With the pressure of the press and the spectators, he is in a position to exploit the recruited players who come under his tutelage. While it is possible for some students on academic scholarships to be used for personal gain, this procedure is unusual and does not receive press coverage. Since the coach's salary increments, his T.V. contracts and his future are dependent upon winning championships, he will leave no stone unturned to win.

Fourth, the motivation of the athlete in high pressure athletics is different than that of the athlete in an educational program. According to James Keating. "Athletes, properly speaking, do not play. They are committed to the pursuit of excellence, an attempt to excel, surpass, go beyond the accomplishment of others." Further, "the very essence of the athletic endeavor lies in the pursuit of excellence through victory in the contest. ...Demands in time and effort are prodigious, involving the meticulous refinement of physical skills, detailed strategic planning, vigorous ascetism, and physical conditioning schedules. ...Such a price may be excessive for the student athlete."

Do not misunderstand this point. Athletics should be fun and athletic activities are playful activities. The intention and attitude of the participant are the crucial determinant whether the activities are fun. "The primary purpose of the person who truly plays is to enjoy the activity itself, to maximize the pleasure of the moment. He may try hard to win, and if he does so, fine. If he loses, however, so what, as long as the activity itself was enjoyable."[20] For these reasons I do not believe it is possible to award athletic scholarships and still preserve athletics as an education tool.

I believe the future of athletics depends on our ability to separate athletics for entertainment from athletics for education. We should provide programs for those who want to attempt the difficult climb to excellence, and we should also provide an opportunity for those individuals who want to play for fun or play for the sake of playing.[21]

---

19. Flath, Arnold, Editor, Athletics in America. (Keating, James W., "Paradoxes in American Athletics," p. 17) Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Nov., 1972.

20. Ibid., p. 18.

21. Ibid. p. 17.

"It matters not whether we are helping a novice or a genius, as long as our goal is that individual's welfare; explicitly, intrinsically and himanistically we are ... educating."[22]

If all coaches were to follow this creed, there would be no need to withhold scholarships from educational athletics. Historically, however, to date we have been unable to avoid the administrative problem related to athletics.

---

22. Olson, Edward, "Intercollegiate Athletics - Is there no way to live with it?", Pittsburgh, NCPEAM Proceedings, 1973. pp 18-23.